

February 4, 1975

SENATOR KREMER: Mr. Chairman, members of the Legislature, I rise in support of this bill like I did, I believe it was in 1969, when it got before us and went on the ballot in 1970 and perhaps for the same reasons. It's my opinion that if there's any time in our procedure in following a bill through that makes it look a little ridiculous, it is at this time. I think Senator Luedtke eluded to that in his opening statements. I too have had a feedback from people that were visiting in the galleries when we read the bill in final reading, they questioned our activities and really wonder if we're paying any attention at all. In my own experience in this I hopefully watch the bill move across the floor and when it got over there I hope I made up my mind. I know what's in the bill and I can see very little value in taking all that time. As a result, we have seen bills that remain and are not processed when we go home at the end of a session. Maybe it's more important that we consider all the bills before us and take the time to read them on final reading page by page. Perhaps if this type of constitutional amendment would pass we could bring into play some type of rules where we could slow up the bill on final reading and discuss it if necessary. That is something that is quite uncertain. I think that's about all I have to say. I believe, I really believe, that if more information would go out to the people when they vote on this, on the ballot, it would pass. The reason it didn't pass before is because most people do not want change, period. They just do not want the change. But I think if they would be properly informed as to what we're attempting to do and why, I have no question in my mind what the general public would accept it.

PRESIDENT: Senator Murphy.

SENATOR MURPHY: Question of Senator Luedtke. Senator, would it be possible to substitute the language referred to by Senator Duis, giving an indication to the public that you are, in fact, substituting a little more deliberate consideration at another stage. I'm not entirely in agreement with it because I think, as Senator Maresh pointed out, I know last year in one particular instance we had a bill amended in committee that didn't take, amended in General File that didn't take, amended in Select File that didn't take, came out on final reading, had it not been for the word-for-word reading on final reading I think everyone would have accepted the bill in the manner in which it had come across. It is, in fact, I think extremely important that the amending that is done on this floor could very easily be lost if you read that bill anywhere but on final reading. I do think as Senator Kremer indicated, people are a little reluctant to allow you to change what they feel is giving the statutes fair and due consideration. I wondered if you would substitute wording there to the effect that it would be considered section by section, as was suggested, on General File. That I certainly would not object to.